

Appl. No. 09/998,392  
Amdt. dated 11/28/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/31/2004

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview of November 24, 2004. Claims 1 - 12 are pending in the present Application. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 - 3, 7 - 9 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because they are directed toward non-statutory subject matter. Further, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nation. Claims 3, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nation in view of Sugiarto et al.

In reviewing the Specification, Applicants have encountered a few typographical/grammatical errors which have been corrected. Applicants have also amended the Specification to include the Serial Nos. of all Related Applications.

In response to the 101 rejections, Applicants have amended Claims 1 - 3 and 7 - 9 to include the phrase "COMPUTER IMPLEMENTED" in front of the method (i.e., Claims 1 - 3) and the apparatus (i.e., Claims 7 - 9) claims. Consequently, Applicants believe that the 101 rejections are no longer warranted. In addition, Applicants have amended Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 to provide proper antecedent basis (i.e., Applicants have replaced the word "method" with the proper phrase).

For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the applied

AUS920011027US1

Page 9 of 12

Appl No. 09/998,392  
Amdt. dated 11/28/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/31/2004

reference. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

As stated in the SPECIFICATION, to bookmark a Web page, a user may have to access a server on which the Web page is stored. Often times, the user will have first accessed a Web portal such as Yahoo. Web portals generally arrange Web pages into categories. When the user accesses a Web portal, it would be greatly convenient if the user is alerted of the Web pages that the user has already bookmarked as the user may then not re-bookmark the Web page. The present invention provides a method that may be used to let a user know whether or not a Web page has already been bookmarked on the user's computer system.

According to the teachings of the invention, when there is a list of Web pages on a server arranged by categories, a comparison will be made between the Web pages in the list and Web pages in a bookmark folder on the user's computer system. All the Web pages in the list that are the same as the Web pages in the bookmark folder will be highlighted. This then tells the user that the (highlighted) Web pages on the server have already been bookmarked.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A computer implemented method of **highlighting Web pages arranged in categories on a server** comprising the steps of:

AUS920011027US1

Page 10 of 12

Appl. No. 09/998,392  
Amdt. dated 11/28/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/31/2004

*comparing bookmarked Web pages in a bookmark folder with the Web pages in the categories; and*

*highlighting all the Web pages in the categories that are the same as the bookmarked Web pages. (Emphasis added.)*

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nation. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nation teaches a method of indicating when clickable image links of hypertext image maps of a computer web browser has been traversed. According to Nation, various web browsing software packages or other hypertext software packages keep a history of various nodes or links that a user has previously visited. This is done to indicate whether a node or link has already been visited anytime thereafter. The indication usually entails changing some feature of the text, e.g., color, font, underline, etc. But, until the disclosure of Nation, the indication only applied to textual links of alphanumeric characters. Nation then provides a method to also indicate whether a clickable image has already been visited.

Specifically, when a clickable graphical image is to be displayed, it is determined, using a history of image links that have been previously visited, whether the clickable image has been traversed. If so, some sort of a marker is used to indicate that the clickable image has already been traversed.

However, Nation does not teach show or suggest highlighting Web pages arranged in categories on a server

AUS920011027US1

Appl. No. 09/998,392  
Amdt. dated 11/28/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 08/31/2004

*by comparing bookmarked Web pages in a bookmark folder with the Web pages in the categories, and highlighting all the Web pages in the categories that are the same as the bookmarked Web pages as claimed.*

Sugiarto et al., the other applied reference, purports to teach an apparatus and method for designating information to be retrieved over a computer network. But as in the case of Nation, Sugiarto et al. does not teach show or suggest *highlighting Web pages arranged in categories on a server by comparing bookmarked Web pages in a bookmark folder with the Web pages in the categories, and highlighting all the Web pages in the categories that are the same as the bookmarked Web pages as claimed*

Consequently, Applicants submit that Claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowable over the cited reference. Independent Claims 4, 7 and 10 and their respective dependent claims, which all incorporate the above-emboldened-italicized limitations shown in the reproduced Claim 1 above, should be allowable as well.

Therefore, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bhupesh Gupta

By:

Volel Emile  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 39,969  
(512) 306-7969

AUS920011027US1

Page 12 of 12